Neighborhood Traffic Calming Workshop Series

MILILANI NEIGHBORHOOD

October 1998

Honolulu, Hawaii

Prepared for the Department of Transportation Services

By Walkable Communities, Inc.

Workshop Leader:	Dan Burden
Traffic Engineer:	Michael Wallwork, P.E.
Report Prepared:	October 16, 1998

Rev. 2/1/99

Table of Contents

Introduction

Workshop

Site Inspections

General Notes

Special Note

Neighborhood map with pedestrian crash locations

Resident Review of Proposed Traffic Calming Scheme

Recommended Traffic Calming Scheme

Drawings Appendix A

Disclaimer

The contents of this report represents the knowledge, experience, and expertise of the citizens and authors in providing ideas and concepts to improve safety, access, mobility and livability through traffic calming and traffic management strategies. This report does not constitute a standard, specification, or regulation. The decision to use a particular device or treatment at a particular location should be made on the basis of an engineering study of the location. This report is not a substitute for sound engineering judgement.

Mayor: Jeremy Harris
Council Members:

Dr. Duke Bainum
John DeSoto
John Henry Felix
Mufi Hannemann
Steve Holmes
Rene Mansho
Andy Mirikitani
Donna Kim
Jon Yoshimura

The Traffic Calming Process

Traffic calming the Mililani Neighborhood began with a partnership between Council Member **Rene Mansho** and the Department of Transportation Services. A sector of the neighborhood was chosen that had expressed concern with traffic speeds and volumes. The Mililani neighborhood board was consulted for advice on the areas to be studied.

In August, 1998, residents of the Mililani area met with a professional traffic calming team and the City and County Department of Transportation Services (DTS) staff to identify traffic problems and solutions. Following input from these residents, expert engineers studied the area, prepared a report, and developed conceptual drawings.

Using a report format, citizens then gave their final recommendations. The consultant made an added study, modified the drawings, and prepared them as an element of this final report.

Workshop

On August 13, 1998, citizens living in the Mililani neighborhood attended a 7 p.m. meeting in the Mililani area in District Park Multi-purpose building to participate in a workshop focusing on the traffic issues in their area. Council Member Rene Mansho opened the charrette and explained this charrette is offered to citizens in response to neighborhood concerns expressed to her. She explained the consultants are here to listen and asked the audience what they were willing to do help solve these problems. Paul Won from DTS then explained the traffic calming program and the method used for selection of neighborhoods. He said the audience would be invited to tell what the problems are, but also what solutions they think might work for their problems. Paul invited Gordon Hong to speak about the Safe Communities program. A brief summary of the program was offered.

Neighborhood Visions

Dan Burden asked the group to express in one to three words what the audience would like their neighborhood to be 20 years from now. They responded:

- Family oriented
- Safe, family, friendly
- Peaceful
- Quiet
- Pedestrian oriented
- Pleasant
- Free of traffic congestion
- Courtesy from pedestrians and drivers
- Clean, landscaped and aesthetically pleasing
- Community

Orientation

Dan then asked if anyone would *not* like any of the items listed. He pointed out that these things are generally achieved when you work on all of them as a unit. He discussed how the streets impact property values, then showed a series of slides. His slides included some areas of Mililani, as well as a variety of streets and traffic calming devices from other cities.

Problems and Concerns

The audience then identified their problems and concerns:

1. Speeding on Makaikai Street, Meheula Parkway, Lanikuhana Avenue, and Kuahelani, especially downhill sections.
2. Meheula Parkway and Kamaio Street Intersection.
3. Red light running at left hand turn from Meheula Parkway onto Lanikuhana Avenue.

4. Lanikuhana Avenue is wide, with cars traveling at speeds of up to 62 mph, even with a median (25 mph posted speed).
5. Kipapa Elementary school speeding.
6. Crosswalk needed at Mililani Mauka Elementary.
7. No crosswalk to tennis courts, basketball courts.
8. Illegal U turns are common on Meheula Parkway.
9. Behind Wal-Mart, people are using Makaimoimo Place as cut through.
10. Getting out of Wal-Mart parking lot, making left turn, is a problem.
11. Pedestrians crossing Lanikuhana Avenue.
12. Speeding on Anania Drive.
13. Need bike lanes (One member of the audience had photos of streets that are overly wide, which are included in the report).
14. Children at Mililani Mauka Elementary School need crosswalk.
15. High School has a serious traffic problem. Students jaywalk to the Burger King across the road after school.
16. Red lights often not obeyed.
17. Meheula Parkway and Anania Drive have speeding problems. Narrow streets with bike lanes and medians.
18. Area behind Safeway.
19. Speeding at curves - people are dying.
20. Speeding occurs even on residential streets. Cars can't be parked on street because of subdivision covenants.
21. Near parks, parents need parking for kids. Mililani was built with wide streets on purpose to provide space for bike lanes and people who jog.
22. Wikao Street.
23. Speeding, 50 mph.
24. No bike lanes, too wide.
25. Need school bus turn around on Wikao Street.

Group Solutions

1. On Kamehameha Highway $700,000 is approved for a traffic signal. Use this money to do other things, possibly a roundabout.
2. Install crosswalk at Mililani Mauka Elementary School. High priority.
3. Bus system is needed (starting in September).
4. On the three main arterial roads, suggest bike lanes because the streets are so wide, but 25 may be too low a speed limit. Narrow streets with bike lanes.
5. Downhill on Lanikuhana Avenue: speed tables and crosswalks to help pedestrians.
6. Roundabouts at intersections on Lanikuhana Avenue.
7. Bike lanes at middle school.
8. Speed table at elementary school.
9. 1st intersection after the freeway: speed monitor and a video camera, even if it isn't working.
10. Meheula Parkway and Anania Drive speeding problems: Narrow streets with bike lanes and medians.

Site Inspection

Site inspections of this area were undertaken several times by team members with and without residents accompanying the team members. During the field surveys vehicle speeds were checked by following various vehicles. Driver behavior was also observed at the problem locations. In each case the problems were readily identifiable.

In addition, a series of other locations were identified that were not raised by residents, but that would benefit from the installation of the traffic calming devices.

General Notes:

1. Each recommendation contributes to a more comfortable environment for pedestrians, bicyclists, property owners and motorists. Some motorists will be noticeably slowed, while others will see a minor change in their speed. In some corridors where stop signs are removed, many residents may see their overall travel times improved.

2. Traffic calming is employed to change driver behavior to make them more considerate of other road users and property owners. Children and seniors are especially impacted by inappropriate motorist behavior.

3. Residents need to be reminded that often, they are the ones who are speeding and generating too many trips, leading to high volumes of traffic and noise in their neighborhood. Since residents use their streets more than anyone else does, any changes have more impact on residents than outsiders.

4. Effective traffic calming requires these specific recommended measures to be made as an overall package. Building just one or several features may cause new traffic patterns that create new problems on these or other streets.

5. Proper landscaping and maintenance of the recommended devices is imperative. If traffic calming devices are designed in a "cheap" fashion or they become ugly over time, they will erode the confidence of the public in having traffic calming features installed on these or other neighborhood streets.

6. Traffic calming requires a six-week to six-month break-in period. Most people adapt to the devices within a day. A transition in behavior occurs. Residents should receive a notice that changes are being made. Literature can be developed pointing out the benefits to the entire neighborhood of a neighborhood traffic calming program in selected areas. If significantly new practices are expected, such as the use of the first roundabout in the neighborhood, a simple graphic and paragraph on how to drive through the device will prove helpful. Benefits of the device for pedestrians and bicyclists can also be made.

7. Traffic calming does not solve all traffic, access, mobility, noise, safety and livability problems in a neighborhood. All residents should be reminded that they must remain or become active in evaluating their traffic conditions.

8. Neighborhood associations and city programs such as the Safe Communities initiative conducted by the Honolulu Police Department can help educate residents about their responsibilities when using the streets. Printed materials, public service announcements, and media coverage are just a few of the methods that can be used to educate the public.

9. The recommended changes will bring nearly 85% of drivers into safe and prudent driving compliance. The remaining 15% can expect to be ticketed on a regular basis until they get the point. Traffic calming devices help police by making the great majority of citizens more responsible.

Special Note:

The area covered by the charrette was too large to be considered a traffic calming scheme. Traffic calming is undertaken in a neighborhood that is well defined by a combination of arterial loads and natural barriers such as rivers, creeks, etc. For example, a typical neighborhood would be the area enclosed by Meheula Parkway to the west, Lanikuhana Avenue to the north and east, and Kamehameha Highway to the south. Under this arrangement each street within this area would be reviewed, especially streets such as Anania Drive, Makaimoimo Street, Wekiu Street and Hikikaulia Street. This method provides the opportunity to solve all transportation problems in streets that comprise the neighborhood.

In the Mililani Charrette most of the comments raised dealt with the arterial road network. Although we have provided, in this report, recommended treatments for the "problem locations" that were raised, they would not normally be part of a neighborhood traffic calming project. The exception is where the arterial road improvements assisted in removing traffic from residential streets. Most of these recommendations would normally be considered part of an arterial road traffic safety program. However, as we drove around the neighborhood to review these sites, a number of locations were found that were not raised, but are clearly locations where traffic calming could be advantageous. Appropriate recommendations for these additional locations are included in this report.

Resident Review of Proposed Traffic Calming Scheme

On October 17, 1998 the second meeting was held at the Mililani Recreation Center. In attendance were Council Member Rene Masho, Mr. Joe Magaldi and several other DTS staff and approximately 15 residents. Michael Wallwork presented a proposed traffic calming scheme for Kipapa Drive at the Kipapa Elementary School, Milalani Waena Elementary School and the Mililani Mauka Elementary School. After his presentation the various devices were discussed in some detail before a vote was taken that overwhelmingly supported the project.

The proposed scheme will be presented by the DTS staff to the Mililani Waena Elementary School Safety Committee to see how the proposed scheme will assist in relieving the problems at the school and if modifications to the scheme could help to improve conditions around the school. A copy of the proposed scheme is shown in Appendix A and is described below.